

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/667,905	Applicant(s) AZUMA ET AL.	
	Examiner Christopher RoDee	Art Unit 1756	

All Participants:

(1) Christopher RoDee.

(2) Mary Montebello, Reg # 33021.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 February 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1-6, 9

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted counsel to suggest an Examiner's Amendment to correct certain outstanding issues. For claims 2 and 9, these claims do not further limit claim 1 and the Examiner suggested that they be cancelled. For claims 3-6 the multiple dependency on claim 2 needs to be removed because of the cancelation of claim 2. For claim 6, the claim needs to refer to the electric charge transferring materials (i.e., plural) because two such materials are present in claim 1. Minor editorial changes to claim 1 were also suggested. Counsel agreed to the amendment.